

WILLIAM J. HUGHES  
2D DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

COMMITTEES:  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONOPOLIES  
AND COMMERCIAL LAW  
SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING  
AD HOC SELECT COMMITTEE ON  
OCS RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-273,311

Congress of the United States  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

LET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-201

327 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515  
(202) 223-6372

DISTRICT OFFICE #1  
2920 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
ATLANTIC CITY, NEW JERSEY 08401  
(609) 343-4844

427 LANDIS AVENUE  
VINELAND, NEW JERSEY 08360  
(609) 696-3269

151 NORTH BROADWAY  
PENNSVILLE, NEW JERSEY 08070  
(609) 678-3333

October 5, 1976

Honorable Marcus Rawden  
Chairman  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555


Dear Chairman Rawden:

I am enclosing, for your evaluation, a communication which I recently received from my constituent, Mr. Alfred C. Coleman, concerning the Salem Nuclear Generating Station.

I would appreciate any comments you might have on the apparent discrepancy which my constituent has pointed out.


With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

  
William J. Hughes  
Member of Congress

WJH:ems

Enclosure




PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-272, 311

OCT 5 1976

35 "H" Drive  
Pennsville, N. J. 08070  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-201

September 26, 1976



Congressman William Hughes  
527 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Congressman:

TRANSPORTATION OF SOLID RADIOACTIVE WASTES

The Final Environmental Statement (FES) related to operation of Salem Nuclear Generating Station Units 1 & 2, FSES# 50-272 & 50-311 dated April 1973 state (under section 5.7.3) that "The applicant has indicated that solid wastes will be shipped to West Valley, New York...."

In view of the attached article in the New York Times (September 24, 1976), "Getty-Oil Subsidiary Says it Won't Reopen Nuclear-Fuels Facility" at West Valley, what now?

The article points out, "The Company said that when the plant suspend operations in 1972...."

How could the NRC accept such a FES with a suspended nuclear fuel reprocessing facility sited?

Very truly yours,

*Alfred C. Coleman, Jr.*

Alfred C. Coleman

CC: Senator Williams  
Senator Case

NYT  
9-24-76

New York Times

## Getty Oil Subsidiary Says It Won't Reopen Nuclear-Fuels Facility

*By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter*  
ROCKVILLE, Md. — Getty Oil Co.'s 83%-owned Nuclear Fuel Services Inc. subsidiary announced that, as expected, it is withdrawing from the nuclear fuel reprocessing business.

The company has the only commercial nuclear fuel reprocessing facility ever to operate in the U.S. The plant, at West Valley in western New York State, processed about 600 metric tons (2,204 8 pounds each) between April 1956, and early 1972, when the facility was closed for modernization and expansion.

The company cited huge additional cost requirements and delays that would be necessary to bring the West Valley plant back into production. It blamed drastically changed regulatory requirements, especially a Nuclear Regulatory Commission ruling last April that imposes sharply more stringent design requirements to protect against earth tremors.

The company said that when the plant suspended operations in 1972, it was expected to be able to resume output two years later, after investing \$15 million to double capacity to 600 metric tons a year and making plant efficiency improvements.

However, in view of the big regulatory changes, delays and inflation, the Getty unit estimates it would take an additional investment of more than \$600 million and take a dozen years to return the plant to production. Indeed, said Nuclear Fuel Services

president Ralph W. Deuster, the drastic seismic criteria change ordered by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission this year "created doubt over whether or not the plant could ever be licensed for commercial reprocessing."

Nuclear Fuel Services said it has "advised its reprocessing customers of its decision, advising them of the impracticability of reprocessing at West Valley and exercising Nuclear Fuel Service's rights of termination under the reprocessing contracts."

A spokesman said the company has "12 or 13" such customers. He said "there's a question about whether one of the contracts was actually in force." He declined to list the customers or give the total value of the contracts, which are believed to run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

As previously reported, Nuclear Fuel Service told customers earlier this year that it was considering withdrawal from the West Valley operation and had promised a final decision later in the year.

One customer, Consumers Power Co. of Jackson, Mich., sued Nuclear Fuel Service in Federal District Court, Buffalo, demanding that it deliver reprocessed fuel under a 1970 contract. The previously reported court case still is pending.

Nuclear Fuel Service said yesterday that it will continue its activities at a specialty nuclear fuels facility it operates in Erwin, Tenn.

